

U.S. Serial No. 09/746,325
Page 9

JUL 20 2007

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed on March 22, 2007 (herein referred to as the "Office Action"), the Applicant respectfully requests entry of this Request for Continued Examination (RCE) with amendments as specifically required by the Examiner in a recommendation by the Examiner on page 3, lines 11-13 of the Office Action. In addition, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the application, based on the above claim amendments and the following remarks. In the Office Action, claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Microsoft PassportTM (herein referred to as "Passport") in view of Koneru et al. (US Patent 5,966,705) (herein referred to as "Koneru").

Claims 1, 2, 4, 7-10 and 12-26 are herein amended and no new matter has been added. Claims 5 and 11 were cancelled in a prior amendment/response filed on 9/8/2005; therefore the rejections of claims 5 and 11 are moot. Claims 1-4, 6-10, and 12-26 remain in the application and the Applicant submits that claims 1-4, 6-10, and 12-26 are in condition for allowance. The rejections are respectfully traversed below.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

On page 2, of the Office Action in the Response to Arguments, the claims were characterized as containing "conditional limitations wherein the claims fail to specifically recite the steps that occur when a cookie does exist on a user machine" (Office Action, page 2, lines 15-19). In addition, on page 3 of the Office Action, it was "recommended that the Applicant further define the conditional limitation in order to distinguish the claims from the . . . [applied] art" (Office Action, page 3, lines 11-13).

The Applicant acknowledges with appreciation the recommendation by the Examiner concerning how to distinguish the claims over the applied art. Claim 1 as amended recites:

wherein the requestor determines whether the cookie exists on the machine of the particular user, and wherein in response to determining that the cookie does exist on the machine of the particular user, the requestor directly obtains information about the particular user, and in response to determining that the cookie does not exist on the machine of the particular user, the requestor indirectly obtains information about the particular user; generates and stores the cookie including

36968/248469
00133/AT&T 0020

U.S. Serial No. 09/746,325

Page 10

the key on the machine of the particular user; and provides the key and the information about the particular user to the cookie management system

(claim 1, lines 13-21). Support is found in the original specification for the recitations of "the requestor directly obtains information about the particular user, and in response to determining that the cookie does not exist, the requestor indirectly . . . obtains the information about the particular user" (claim 1, lines 13-17), where the specification discusses examples of if "the cookie does not exist, as determined at 44, then at 50 the web server 25 requests an available key from the cookie management system 30. The web server 25 gathers information on the user at 52, such as from direct input from the user or indirectly through observation" (specification, page 8, lines 17-20; also, see page 10, lines 3-4). Therefore, the Applicant herein follows the recommendation made by the Examiner in the Office Action and claim 1 as amended now further distinguishes and defines over the applied, art as recommended at page 3, lines 11-13 of the Office Action. Therefore, Passport and Koneru either combined together or taken individually fail to teach or suggest each recitation of claim 1. Thus, for at least the above reasons claim 1 is allowable.

In addition, in item 5 on page 5, at lines 1-10 of the Office Action, it was implied that Passport (at "Examiner numbered pages 13 -15") allegedly shows the recitation of claim 1 as amended, in regard to a key included in a cookie, which recites: "receiving a key associated with the request at the cookie management system from the requestor over the Internet, wherein the key associated with the request is included in a cookie on a machine of the particular user" (claim 1, lines 7-9). However, what was cited in Passport (at "Examiner numbered pages 13 -15") discusses cookies (see Examiner numbered page 15 at lines 23-30) and encryption in general terms (see Examiner numbered page 13, at lines 32-34, page 14, at lines 1-3 and page 15, at lines 23-25); however, Passport is silent in regard to "wherein the key associated with the request is included in a cookie" as recited in amended claim 1, lines 7-9. For these additional reasons, claim 1 is allowable.

Independent claims 9 and 16 include recitations of "whether the cookie exists" and the "response to determining that the cookie does not exist" in manners similar to the recitations of claim 1. Further, dependent claims 2-4, 6-8, 21 and 24 depend from claim 1; dependent claims 10, 12-15, 22 and 25 depend from claim 9; and dependent claims 17-20, 23 and 26 depend from

36968/248469
00133/AT&T 0020

U.S. Serial No. 09/746,325

Page 11

claim 16. Therefore, claims 2-4, 6-10 and 12-26 distinguish over the applied art of record and are allowable for at least the reasons discussed above in regard to claim 1.

CONCLUSION

For all of the above reasons, claims 1-4, 6-10, and 12-26 are allowable over Passport and Koneru either combined together or taken individually.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and a Notice of Allowance issued. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicant's attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is cordially requested to telephone the undersigned.

In the event the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks deems additional fees to be due in connection with this application, Applicant's attorney hereby authorizes that such fees be charged to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

John Leonard Young

Registration No. 57,150

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

55 Griffin Road South

Bloomfield, CT 06002

Telephone: (404) 607-9991

Facsimile: (404) 607-9981

Customer No. 36192

Date: July 20, 2007